



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

DN
[Signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/003, 972 01/07/98 STOUB

E 353197

EXAMINER

TM02/0411

LATHROP AND GAGE
2345 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY MO

ROSSI, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165
[Signature]

DATE MAILED:

04/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/003,972	Applicant(s) STOUB
Examiner Jeffrey Allen ROSSI	Group Art Unit 2122



Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 24, 2001

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle 835 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

Claim(s) 35-111 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) NONE is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 35-111 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
 received.
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES --

Art Unit: 2122

DETAILED ACTION

1. Action is responsive to: the continued prosecution application, filed 1-24-01.
2. Claims 1-34 have been canceled. Claims 35-111 are pending as filed with the CPA.
3. The group art unit of your case is 2122. Using the most current art unit information will help us respond in a more timely fashion.

Appendix

The *Appendix* is objected to as comprising more than 10 pages and not having been submitted in microfiche form. See 37 CFR 1.96. Under no circumstances will the application be passed to issue without correction of this problem.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. For example, the step flow diagrams lack a

Art Unit: 2122

recitation of determining column widths, and they lack a depiction of selecting fonts. They lack a depiction of the claimed screen printing mechanism No new matter may be entered..

Oath/Declaration

5. This application presents a claim for subject matter not originally claimed or embraced in the statement of the invention. Specifically, Applicant explicitly claims HTML output for example e.g., claim 44. A supplemental oath or declaration is required under 37 CFR 1.67. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2122

7. Claims 44 56 59 61 80 94 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

8. Regarding claim 44, 56, 80 and 94 it is first noted that Applicant intended to make claim 44 dependent on independent claim 35, since claim 1 has been canceled. Assuming this is the case, claims 44, 56, 80 and 94 represents new matter since Applicant disclosed reformatting HTML documents, but did not originally disclose outputting the reformatted documents as HTML. It appears that the reformatted document is outputted in a proprietary format.

9. Per independent claim 59, the process of determining a display capability of a window was not described.

10. Per dependent claim 61, no support is provided for claimed range of characters per line

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 42 and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2122

Since Applicant has referred to "the source" without first describing a source the claim is indefinite. The Examiner likely concurs that a source is probably *inherent* in the claimed invention (in fact, there are probably many inherent attributes that may be considered inherently the source). However, multiple parts of the invention could be referred to as "a source", therefore, the reference to the source has multiple possibilities in terms of correspondence if one deems it inherent. In short, the reader is left to wonder "which source?". Therefore, there is a lack of clear antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 35-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,012,071 A, hereinafter KRISHNA, inview of WAGSTAFF, SEAN, " FutureTense Texture 1.1 designs dynamic pages. (Future Tense's Web authoring software) (Software Review)(Evaluation)," *MacWEEK*, vol. 11 No. 16, pp. p38(1), 04/1997.

Art Unit: 2122

Dependent claims incorporate all the rationale of the rejection as set forth in the previous claims in the dependency chain. First order dependency has been indicated in parentheses () for Applicant's convenience.

15. Per independent claim 35, KRISHNA demonstrates: a system for generating a source in a non-scrolling format for display in a display window using a processor comprising:
a screen page formatting mechanism ("browser"—col. 3, lines 25 and element 100, FIG. 1) configured to form a screen page dimensioned to fit the display window, to calculate a number of columns that will fit within the screen page (108 and 104), each column having a width characteristic (inherent—FIG. 1), and to format the screen page for the number of columns (FIG. 1); and

a display page formatting mechanism configured to format the source as a display document having a user selected font characteristic and a plurality of display pages each non-scrollably displayable for the screen page ("separate a publication's content from its format"—col. 4, lines 39-40; "sources for each region of a publication"—col. 4, lines 51-53; "The characteristics of each region may include the region's size, resolution, font, text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication, leading, indentation, background color and special treatment."—col. 8, lines 14-18).

The Examiner admits that the exemplary page 100 in FIG. 1, shows scrollable columns, wherein the claim recites "non-scrollably displayed". Nonetheless, this reference recites a multi-page publication embodiment (col. 8, lines 43-50), and suggests formatting

Art Unit: 2122

the multiple pages per user preferences (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication”—col. 8, lines 15-17)

TEXTURE 1.1, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a related product (commonly owned by Futertense, Inc.); for authoring “dynamic pages that go beyond HTML’s limitations...[including] automatic hyphenations”—page 1. It explicitly demonstrates “flow[ing] text automatically in columns, complete with hyphenation... By itself, multi-column text is a nice feature, but multi-column support with text imported on the fly, even if you don’t know how long it will be. If it is longer than the box you have designated for it, you can make buttons that let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at a time”—page 2. Note that although the term “scroll” is used, it refers to a pageful at a time, which is consistent with the Applicant’s recitation of “non-scrollably” displayed. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e. PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to non-scrollably display KRISHNA in a manner taught by *TEXTURE 1.1* because in all likelihood the two publications describe the same product, or at least methods that have a strong technical relationship to each other as evidenced by the observation that they are in the same technical field of endeavor and were commonly owned. Further motivation to combine resulted from the observation that both inventions were directed to reformatting text from HTML sources “on the fly”.

It is noted that Applicant has claimed a “mechanism” which is usually associated with a device. However, it is clear from Applicant’s specification that it would be

Art Unit: 2122

impossible to claim a mechanism in that sense since no mechanical device for performing the claimed steps is recited. Therefore, "mechanism" refers to a process, which is a way of claiming computer code operating on a generic processor.

16. Per independent claim 85, a method directed to the "mechanism" of independent claim 35, supra, this claim is identically rejected.

17. Per dependent claim 36(35), KRISHNA further disclosed "the width characteristic comprises a range of a number of characters per line." inherent in columns 104 and 108, and as was notoriously well-known in the art at the time of the invention.

18. Per independent claim 86(85), a method directed to the "mechanism" of independent claim 35, supra, this claim is identically rejected.

19. Per dependent claim 37(35) KRISHNA further disclosed wherein the display document comprises text ("publication"—ABSTRACT).

20. Per dependent claim 38(35), both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* explicitly discussed wherein the display page formatting mechanism further is configured to identify an in-line command in the source and to format the display document according to the in-line command (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; "text, image, graphic, animation, or link"—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; "deliver texture pages as plain HTML"—page 1; "Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns..."page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

Art Unit: 2122

21. Per dependent claim 39(35); KRISHNA further discloses claimed image resizing mechanism configured to resize a graphic image from the source to fit within at least one column of the display document ("scale down... and scale up an image"—col. 6, lines 17-25)

22. Per dependent claim 40(35) and 41(4) KRISHNA further discloses claimed substitution of a thumbnail for a full sized image, and subsequent expansion of the thumbnail for a full sized image: " For example, the viewer can obtain a low-resolution version of an image from a first resource. In response to a user selecting the image, e.g., via a mouse click, the viewer may be instructed to obtain a high-resolution version of the image from a second resource. "—col. 5, lines 45-50).

23. Per dependent claim 42(35) and 43(42); KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* disclose claimed formatting mechanism configured to be responsive to a formatting command embedded in the source to format a portion of at least one display page according to the formatting command and wherein said command is HTML (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; "text, image, graphic, animation, or link"—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; "deliver texture pages as plain HTML"—page 1; "Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns..." page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

24. Per dependent claim 44(35) KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of

Art Unit: 2122

TEXTURE 1.1 that they were working on a plug in that would deliver *TEXTURE* pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

25. Per dependent claim 45(35) the output of KRISNA is a web based page (col. 8, lines 42-50).

26. Per dependent claim 46(35) and 47(35), KRISHNA discloses resizing images (col. 5, lines 41-56). It further discloses: "An HTML file may contain "elements" such as text, graphics, tables, buttons, etc., "—col. 1, lines 55-60. . It would have been obvious to PHOSITA to resize tables in KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* because it was explicitly suggested by KRISHNA as described in the passages referred to.

27. Per dependent claim 48(35) KRISHNA resizing information via scale-down (col. 6, lines 16-25). "Official Notice" is hereby taken that it was notoriously well-known in the art to include tables in images. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA to reduce tables in KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* in order to allow the user to select information of further interest in a manner suggested by KRISHNA (col. 5, lines 42-55).

28. Per dependent claim 49(35), the number of columns in KRISHNA and TEXTURE may comprise more than one ("multi-column"—col. 8, lines 14-17 or KRISHNA.

29. Per independent claim 50, KRISHNA demonstrates: a system for generating a source in a non-scrolling format for display in a display window using a processor comprising:

Art Unit: 2122

a screen page formatting mechanism (“browser”—col. 3, lines 25 and element 100, FIG. 1) configured to form a screen page dimensioned to fit the display window,; and a display page formatting mechanism configured to format the source as a display document having a user selected font characteristic and a plurality of display pages each non-scrollably displayable for the screen page (“separate a publication’s content from its format”—col. 4, lines 39-40; “sources for each region of a publication”—col. 4, lines 51-53; “The characteristics of each region may include the region’s size, resolution, font, text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication, leading, indentation, background color and special treatment.”—col. 8, lines 14-18).

The Examiner admits that the exemplary page 100 in FIG. 1, shows scrollable columns, wherein the claim recites “non-scrollably displayed”. Nonetheless, this reference recites a multi-page publication embodiment (col. 8, lines 43-50), and suggests formatting the multiple pages per user preferences (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication”—col. 8, lines 15-17)

TEXTURE 1.1, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a related product (commonly owned by Futertense, Inc.); for authoring “dynamic pages that go beyond HTML’s limitations...[including] automatic hyphenations”—page 1. It explicitly demonstrates “flow[ing] text automatically in columns, complete with hyphenation... By itself, multi-column text is a nice feature, but multi-column support with text imported on the fly, even if you don’t know how long it will be. If it is longer than the box you have

Art Unit: 2122

designated for it, you can make buttons that let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at a time”—page 2. Note that although the term “scroll” is used, it refers to a pageful at a time, which is consistent with the Applicant’s recitation of “non-scrollably” displayed. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e. PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to non-scrollably display KRISHNA in a manner taught by *TEXTURE 1.1* because in all likelihood the two publications describe the same product, or at least methods that have a strong technical relationship to each other as evidenced by the observation that they are in the same technical field of endeavor and were commonly owned. Further motivation to combine resulted from the observation that both inventions were directed to reformatting text from HTML sources “on the fly”.

30. Per dependent claim 51(50), KRISNA further disclosed “the width characteristic comprises a range of a number of characters per line.” inherent in columns 104 and 108, and as was notoriously well-known in the art at the time of the invention.

31. Per dependent claim 52(50) KRISHNA further disclosed wherein the display document comprises text (“publication”—ABSTRACT).

32. Per dependent claim 53(50) and 54(50) and 55(50), both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* explicitly discussed wherein the display page formatting mechanism further is configured to identify an in-line command in the source and to format the display document according to the in-line command (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; “text, image, graphic, animation, or link”—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; “deliver texture pages as

Art Unit: 2122

plain HTML"—page 1; "Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns..." page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

33. Per dependent claim 56(35) KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of *TEXTURE 1.1* that they were working on a plug in that would deliver TEXTURE pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

34. Per dependent claim 57(50) the output of KRISNA is a web based page (col. 8, lines 42-50).

35. Per independent claim 58, KRISHNA demonstrates: a system for generating a source in a non-scrolling format for display in a display window using a processor comprising: a screen page formatting mechanism ("browser"—col. 3, lines 25 and element 100, FIG. 1); and

a display page formatting mechanism configured to format the source as a display document having a user selected font characteristic and a plurality of display pages each non-scrollably displayable for the screen page ("separate a publication's content from its format"—col. 4, lines 39-40; "sources for each region of a publication"—col. 4, lines 51-53; "The characteristics of each region may include the region's size, resolution, font, text flow

Art Unit: 2122

from column to column in a multi-column publication, leading, indentation, background color and special treatment.”—col. 8, lines 14-18) and to fill the screen page with at least one display page (FIG. 1)..

The Examiner admits that the exemplary page 100 in FIG. 1, shows scrollable columns, wherein the claim recites “non-scrollably displayed”. Nonetheless, this reference recites a multi-page publication embodiment (col. 8, lines 43-50), and suggests formatting the multiple pages per user preferences (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication”—col. 8, lines 15-17)

TEXTURE 1.1, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a related product (commonly owned by Futertense, Inc.); for authoring “dynamic pages that go beyond HTML’s limitations...[including] automatic hyphenations”—page 1. It explicitly demonstrates “flow[ing] text automatically in columns, complete with hyphenation... By itself, multi-column text is a nice feature, but multi-column support with text imported on the fly, even if you don’t know how long it will be. If it is longer than the box you have designated for it, you can make buttons that let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at a time”—page 2. Note that although the term “scroll” is used, it refers to a pageful at a time, which is consistent with the Applicant’s recitation of “non-scrollably” displayed. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e. PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to non-scrollably display KRISHNA in a manner taught by *TEXTURE 1.1* because in all likelihood the two publications describe the same product, or at least methods

Art Unit: 2122

that have a strong technical relationship to each other as evidenced by the observation that they are in the same technical field of endeavor and were commonly owned. Further motivation to combine resulted from the observation that both inventions were directed to reformatting text from HTML sources "on the fly".

36. Per dependent claim 59(58), the system of KRISHNA is further configured to determine a display capability of said window ("uses this time as an identifier of a viewer"—col. 10, lines 26-36. Alternately, it is noted that it was notoriously well-known to identify a browser and would have been implicit in the combination of KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1*.

37. Per dependent claim 60(58), KRISHNA further demonstrates calculate a number of columns that will fit within the screen page (108 and 104), each column having a width characteristic, and to format the screen page for the number of columns (FIG. 1).

Per dependent claim 61(60), the characters per line is inherent in KRISHNA as was notoriously well-known in the art.

38. Per dependent claim 61(60), defining a range of acceptable characters per line was notoriously well-known. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to allow the user of KRISNA to specify a range of characters per line in order to allow automatic optimal selection of font size, and to allow for flexibility in the output display page, to ease display constraints.

Art Unit: 2122

39. Per dependent claim 62(60), the combination expressly applied was a multi-column format. However, it is noted that both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* expressly provide the opportunity for the user to determine the number of columns in the output, and that a single column is implicitly suggested in the combined teachings.

40. Per dependent claim 63(60), KRISHNA discloses a multi-column format (col. 8, lines 14-17 and

41. Per depednent claim 64(58) KRISHNA demonstrates claimed font sizing mechanism (“...property sheet user interface... The characteristics of each region may include... font”—col. 8, lines 14-18).

42. Per dependent claim 65(64) and 66(64) it was notoriously well-known to calculate the number of columns that would fit in a given page for a given font size. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to include this feature in the design tool of KRISHNA in order to facilitate the formatting of KRISHNA.

43. Per dependent claim 67(66); KRISHNA is configured to reformat the display page according to parameters including font size (col. 8, lines 6-25).

44. Per dependent claim 68 (58); KRISHNA further disclosed wherein the display document comprises text (“publication”—ABSTRACT).

45. Per dependent claim 69(58); KRISHNA further discloses partially or totally filling a display screen (browser 230—FIGS 1-2.)

Art Unit: 2122

46. Per dependent claim 70(58); both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* explicitly discussed wherein the display page formatting mechanism further is configured to identify an in-line command in the source and to format the display document according to the in-line command (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; “text, image, graphic, animation, or link”—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; “deliver texture pages as plain HTML”—page 1; “Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns...”page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

47. Per dependent claim 71(58); KRISHNA further discloses claimed image resizing mechanism configured to resize a graphic image from the source to fit within at least one column of the display document (“scale down... and scale up an image”—col. 6, lines 17-25).

48. Per dependent claim 72(58) and 73(72); KRISHNA further discloses claimed substitution of a thumbnail for a full sized image, and subsequent expansion of the thumbnail for a full sized image: “ For example, the viewer can obtain a low-resolution version of an image from a first resource. In response to a user selecting the image, e.g., via a mouse click, the viewer may be instructed to obtain a high-resolution version of the image from a second resource. ”—col. 5, lines 45-50).

49. Per dependent claim 74(58); *TEXTURE 1.1* describes claimed page turning mechanism (“...make buttons to let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at a time”—page 2).

Art Unit: 2122

50. Per dependent claim 75(58), KRISHNA suggests that one can maximize the viewer 230, since it operates similar to a browser, and because KRISHNA operates in a browser (col. 3, line 65 et seq.).

51. Per dependent claim 76(58) KRISHNA operates in a browser on a computer screen, and this was a well-known attribute of a browser window when sized to user preferences.

52. Per dependent claim 77(58), it was notoriously well known to print contents of a browser as was taught by KRISHNA (“display or print”—col. 2, line 28).

53. Per dependent claim 78(58); and 79(78); KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* disclose claimed formatting mechanism configured to be responsive to a formatting command embedded in the source to format a portion of at least one display page according to the formatting command and wherein said command is HTML (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; “text, image, graphic, animation, or link”—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; “deliver texture pages as plain HTML”—page 1; “Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns...”page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

54. Per dependent claim 80(58); KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of *TEXTURE 1.1* that they were working on a plug in that would deliver TEXTURE pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2122

output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

55. Per dependent claim 81(58); the output of KRISNA is a web-based page (col. 8, lines 42-50):

56. Per dependent claim 82(58) and 83(58); KRISHNA discloses resizing *images* (col. 5, lines 41-56). It further discloses: "An HTML file may contain "elements" such as text, graphics, *tables*, buttons, etc.,"—col. 1, lines 55-60.. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA to resize tables in KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* because it was explicitly suggested by KRISHNA as described in the passages referred to *supra*. Furthermore, it was notoriously well-known to include a table in an image, and thus this limitation is explicitly suggested in KRISHNA.

57. Per dependent claim 84(58), Krishna discloses a screen printing mechanism ("display or print"—col. 2, line 28), as was notoriously well-known in the browser art.

58. Per dependent claim 87(85), KRISHNA demonstrates displaying the display page (FIG. 1).

59. Per independent claim 88, KRISHNA discloses a method for generating electronic information in a non-scrolling format (FIG. 1) for display in a display window using a processor comprising ("browser"—col. 3, lines 25 and element 100, FIG. 1):

Art Unit: 2122

forming a screen page dimensioned to fit the display window (FIG. 1, viewer 230—col. 10, lines 36-38); sizing the electronic information to a selected font (“The characteristics of each region may include the region’s size, resolution, font, text flow...”—col. 8, lines 14-18);

formatting the electronic information to form a display document having display pages wherein each display page is wholly displayable in the screen display (“separate a publication’s content from its format”—col. 4, lines 39-40; “sources for each region of a publication”—col. 4, lines 51-53; . and generating for non-scrollable display at least one display page (FIG.1).

The Examiner admits that the exemplary page 100 in FIG. 1, shows scrollable columns, wherein the claim recites “non-scrollably displayed” And “wholly displayable”. Nonetheless, this reference recites a multi-page publication embodiment (col. 8, lines 43-50), and suggests formatting the multiple pages per user preferences (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication”—col. 8, lines 15-17).

TEXTURE 1.1, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a related product (commonly owned by Futertense, Inc.); for authoring “dynamic pages that go beyond HTML’s limitations...[including] automatic hyphenations”—page 1. It explicitly demonstrates “flow[ing] text automatically in columns, complete with hyphenation... By itself, multi-column text is a nice feature, but multi-column support with text imported on the fly, even if you don’t know how long it will be. If it is longer than the box you have designated for it, you can make buttons that let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at

Art Unit: 2122

a time”—page 2. Note that although the term “scroll” is used, it refers to a pageful at a time, which is consistent with the Applicant’s recitation of “non-scrollably” displayed. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e. PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to non-scrollably display KRISHNA in a manner taught by *TEXTURE 1.1* because in all likelihood the two publications describe the same product, or at least methods that have a strong technical relationship to each other as evidenced by the observation that they are in the same technical field of endeavor and were commonly owned. Further motivation to combine resulted from the observation that both inventions were directed to reformatting text from HTML sources “on the fly”.

60. Per dependent claim 89(88); KRISHNA discloses a base font (e.g., “Times New Roman”—col. 6, lines 35-45).

61. Per dependent claim 90(88); KRISHNA further discloses claimed image resizing mechanism configured to resize a graphic image from the source to fit within at least one column of the display document (“scale down... and scale up an image”—col. 6, lines 17-25).

62. Per dependent claim 91(88); KRISHNA further discloses claimed substitution of a thumbnail for a full sized image, and subsequent expansion of the thumbnail for a full sized image: “ For example, the viewer can obtain a low-resolution version of an image from a first resource. In response to a user selecting the image, e.g., via a mouse click, the viewer

Art Unit: 2122

may be instructed to obtain a high-resolution version of the image from a second resource.

“—col. 5, lines 45-50).

63. Per dependent claim 92(88); KRISHNA further discloses changing the selected font (“font”—col. 4, lines 37-50).

Per dependent claim 93; the combination of KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as described supra (claim 88) explicitly addressed “reformatting” (e.g., importing HTML ‘on the fly’) and “wholly displayable” (e.g., “...scroll up or down one page at a time). Therefore the method and motivation for combination are as previously set forth, supra.

Per dependent claim 94 (88);KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of *TEXTURE 1.1* that they were working on a plug-in that would deliver *TEXTURE* pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

64. Per dependent claim 95(88); the output of KRISNA is a web based page (col. 8, lines 42-50).

65. Per independent claim 96, KRISHNA discloses a method for generating electronic information in a non-scrolling format (FIG. 1) for display in a display window using a processor comprising (“browser”—col. 3, lines 25 and element 100, FIG. 1):

Art Unit: 2122

forming a screen page dimensioned to fit the display window (FIG. 1, viewer 230—col. 10, lines 36-38);

formatting sizing the electronic information to a selected font (“The characteristics of each region may include the region’s size, resolution, font, text flow...”—col. 8, lines 14-18);

and a plurality of display pages which are non-scrollably displayable in the screen display (“separate a publication’s content from its format”—col. 4, lines 39-40; “sources for each region of a publication”—col. 4, lines 51-53;

The Examiner admits that the exemplary page 100 in FIG. 1, shows scrollable columns, wherein the claim recites “non-scrollably displayed” And “wholly displayable”. Nonetheless, this reference recites a multi-page publication embodiment (col. 8, lines 43-50), and suggests formatting the multiple pages per user preferences (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication”—col. 8, lines 15-17)

TEXTURE 1.1, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a related product (commonly owned by Futertense, Inc.); for authoring “dynamic pages that go beyond HTML’s limitations...[including] automatic hyphenations”—page 1. It explicitly demonstrates “flow[ing] text automatically in columns, complete with hyphenation... By itself, multi-column text is a nice feature, but multi-column support with text imported on the fly, even if you don’t know how long it will be. If it is longer than the box you have designated for it, you can make buttons that let the viewer scroll up or down one screenful at

Art Unit: 2122

a time”—page 2. Note that although the term “scroll” is used, it refers to a pageful at a time, which is consistent with the Applicant’s recitation of “non-scrollably” displayed. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e. PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to non-scrollably display KRISHNA in a manner taught by *TEXTURE 1.1* because in all likelihood the two publications describe the same product, or at least methods that have a strong technical relationship to each other as evidenced by the observation that they are in the same technical field of endeavor and were commonly owned. Further motivation to combine resulted from the observation that both inventions were directed to reformatting text from HTML sources “on the fly”.

66. Per dependent claim 97(96); displaying a number of columns with a width characteristic is inherent in the combination as previously set forth in the rejection of independent claim 96, supra.

67. Per dependent claim 98(96); KRISHNA further disclosed wherein the display document comprises text (“publication”—ABSTRACT).

68. Per dependent claim 99(96) 100(96 and 101(06); both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* explicitly discussed wherein the display page formatting mechanism further is configured to identify an in-line command in the source and to format the display document according to the in-line command (HTML source file 218—col. 7, line 40; “text, image, graphic, animation, or link”—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; “deliver texture pages as plain

Art Unit: 2122

HTML"—page 1; "Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns..."page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

69. Per dependent claim 102 (96); KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of *TEXTURE 1.1* that they were working on a plug in that would deliver *TEXTURE* pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

70. Per dependent claim 103(96); the output of KRISNA is a web-based page (col. 8, lines 42-50).

71. Per independent claim 104, this is a method directed to the system of independent claim 58, and is identically rejected to independent claim 58, supra.

72. Per dependent claim 105(104); KRISHNA discloses claimed determining a number of columns that can fit within a screen page and formatting the screen page (text flow from column to column in a multi-column publication"—col. 8, lines 15-20.

73. Per dependent claim 106(105); KRISHNA further disclosed wherein the display document comprises text ("publication"—ABSTRACT).

74. Per dependent claim 107(104) 108(104) and 109 (104); both KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* explicitly discussed wherein the display page formatting mechanism further

Art Unit: 2122

is configured to identify an in-line command in the source and to format the display document according to the in-line command (HTML source file **218**—col. 7, line 40; “text, image, graphic, animation, or link”—col. 7, lines 62-65 of KRISHNA; “deliver texture pages as plain HTML”—page 1; “Text that contains HTML formatted tags will appear in the appropriate format in the flowing columns...”page 2 of *TEXTURE 1.1*).

75. Per dependent claim 110 (104); KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* lacks wherein the display page is generated for display as a hypertext markup language page because they both required a proprietary viewer. Nonetheless, WAGSTAFF discloses in its description of *TEXTURE 1.1* that they were working on a plug in that would deliver TEXTURE pages as plain HTML. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to output KRISHNA and *TEXTURE 1.1* as HTML because FUTURETENSE was working on it, in order to allow texture pages to be read as plug-ins for popular browsers.

76. Per dependent claim 111(104); the output of KRISNA is a web based page (col. 8, lines 42-50).

Art Unit: 2122

Remarks

The rejections under the COREL NEHAB and IBM references have not been reapplied because the “best” rejection was applied. The Patent & Trademark Office *explicitly* applies the *closest* prior-art in the reasoned statement. Nonetheless, although Applicant apparently attempted to amend via drafting new claims around those references via (*i.e.*, submission of new claims 35-111 presumably over these references), this is believed unsuccessful. The Applicant’s arguments in the amendment of 9-5-00 were not convincing; and the Examiner disagrees with the majority of the arguments presented; however, a response to those arguments would be moot in light of new grounds of rejection. Nonetheless, these references may be *reapplied* should Applicant’s new amendments render them “better” references as grounds for rejections, and Applicant’s remarks will be responded to at that time if this is the case.

The number of claims presented appear unduly multiple, and unnecessarily repetitious. It is confusing to the public, because it is not believed that many of the claims have a significantly different scope. Applicant appears to be “mixing and Matching” descriptors of the invention with no clear focus on the invention being claimed.

Art Unit: 2122

Prior Art Cited

NPL

DYSON, P. E., "FutureTense's Texture: slow page viewer mars powerful design tool," *Seybold Report on Internet Publishing*, vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 5-8, 09/1996.

Art Unit: 2122

Conclusion

77. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to

(703)-308-9051 (formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703)-305-9724 (informal communications labeled PROPOSED or DRAFT)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

78. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jeffrey ROSSI whose telephone number is (703) 308-5213. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 0830 to 1630 EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark POWELL, can be reached on (703) 305-9703.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JR

April 9, 2001

WELL
EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100